UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,669	01/07/2005	Yasuyoshi Ueda	21581-00500-US	2338
	7590 04/13/201 OVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STR SUITE 1100	EET, N.W.	BARHAM, BETHANY P		
WASHINGTO!	N, DC 20006	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/501,669	UEDA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	BETHANY BARHAM	1615					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause				
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ will ided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>15,16,21-24,29 and 30</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-14 and 17-20</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>11/25/09</u>	2					
	/S. TRAN/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1615					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the proposed claim amendment will be entered. As such claims 15-16, 21-24, and 29-30 remain rejected under 102 or 103 over the art of record Chopra which teaches adding ubiquinol to an oil/fat that is heated and further adding a sweetener and that the composition is then removed from the heat and mixed while cooled forming a oral palatable food composition such as a syrup (abstract, col.7-11 and claim 1).

Applicant's argue that the prior art does not teach or suggest solidifyling or plasticizing the mixture and that it is not a homogeneous composition. The Examiner respectfully points out that the instant claims directed to a process only require i) dissolving ubiquinol in oil/fat (MP of not lower than 20 degrees C) under heating, ii) cooling the solution/composition, and iii) manufacturing the ubiquinol enriched oil/fat containing food product which the prior art teaches, no separate step of solidifying or plasticizing is listed. The limitations 'for solidification' and 'for plasticization' are not given patentable weight as they are directed to intented use. Further, the argument with respect to homogeneous oil/fat composition is not persuasive as the prior art teaches adding ubiquinol to oil/fat (tallow, lard, etc) and heating the combination and that the composition is then removed from the heat and mixed while cooled forming a product (such as syrup in Example 1), and since the process/composition of the prior art are the same as instant claimed the product formed would naturally be homogenous.